

REMARKS

The above amendments and the following remarks are fully and completely responsive to the Office Action dated September 27, 2004. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application with claims 14-20 amended. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 2-11, 13, 15-18 and 20 were acknowledged as containing allowable subject matter but were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; claim 14 and its dependent claims were objected to for formal matters; and claims 1, 12, 14 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). No new matter has been added. Claims 1-20 are presented for reconsideration.

Claim Objections

Claims 14-20 were objected to for formal reasons. Specifically, the Office Action stated that the phrase "second substrate" in claim 14 and its dependents should be changed to --substrate--; the phrase "third driver" in claim 14 and its dependents should be changed to --second driver--; and the phrase "third buffers" in claim 14 and its dependents should be changed to --second buffers--. Applicants' amendments to claims 14-20 make these changes. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 14-20.

Claims 2-11, 13, 15-18 and 20 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter but were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. As discussed below, claims 1 and 14 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 2-11, 13, 15-18 and 20.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 12, 14 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (two different rejections) as being anticipated by Saito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,629,888, "Saito"). In making these rejections, the Office Action asserts that this reference teaches each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants disagree and request reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

a plurality of first substrate lines connected to substrates of said transfer transistors and of said driver transistors, respectively;

Claim 14, as amended, recites, in part:

a plurality of substrate lines connected to substrates of said load transistors, respectively;

The Office Action asserts that the plate lines (PLs) illustrated in Figures 23 and 29 of Saito are the recited substrate lines. However, it is clear from Figures 22 and 23 of Saito that plate line 429 is connected to ferroelectric capacitor 428. Similarly, the plate lines shown in Figure 29 are also connected to ferroelectric capacitors. The ferroelectric capacitors are connected to the transfer transistor 431 as disclosed at column 19, lines 26-30.

In contrast, the substrate of the present invention is a silicon substrate (semiconductor substrate), as shown in Figure 3 and as defined in the description of Figure 3.

Additionally, the substrate lines disclosed in the present application do not function in the same manner as the plate lines of Saito. For example, the plate lines in Saito cannot control the threshold voltage of the transfer transistors. Consequently, the

plate lines in Saito cannot shorten the access time during the operation of the SRAM and cannot reduce the standby current. In contrast, the present invention, using the recited substrate lines, can shorten the access time during operation of the SRAM and reduce the standby current.

Accordingly, Saito fails to disclose and/or suggest the claimed invention. Regarding claim 1 and the claims that depend thereon, Saito fails to disclose and/or suggest "a plurality of first substrate lines connected to substrates of said transfer transistors and of said driver transistors, respectively". Regarding claim 14 and the claims that depend thereon, Saito fails to disclose and/or suggest "a plurality of substrate lines connected to substrates of said local transistors". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 12, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Conclusion

Applicants' amendments and remarks have overcome the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action dated September 27, 2004. Specifically, Applicants' amendments of claims 14-20 overcome the objections to these claims. Applicants' remarks have distinguished claims 1, 12, 14 and 19 from Saito and thus overcome the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 2-11, 13, 15-18 and 20 were acknowledged as containing allowable subject matter but were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. This objection has been overcome by the remarks regarding claims 1, 12, 14 and 19. Accordingly, claims 1-20

are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of claims 1-20.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment for any additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to attorney docket number 108397-00108.

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX PLLC



Rustan J. Hill
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJH/elz

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time

TECH/282255.1